OF TRUTH or SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day,* 1897.**

Vol. VI. } **MADRAS, JANUARY & FEBRUARY 1903.** { **No. 8.& 9**

THE MIRIGENDRA AGAMA.

(*Continued from page* 195 *of Vol. IV.*)

CHAPTER X.

ग्रन्थिजन्यं कलाकालविद्यारागनृमातरः ।
गुणधीगर्वचित्ताक्षबात्रभूतान्यनुक्रमात् ॥ (1)

विधत्ते देहसिद्ध्यर्थं यत्साक्षाद् यत्पदान्तरात् ।
यथा युनक्ति यद्धेतोस् तादृक् तदधुनोच्यते ॥ (2)

कर्तृशक्तिरणो नित्या विभ्वी चेश्वरशक्तिवत् ।
तमच्छन्नतयार्थेषु नाभाति निरनुग्रहा ॥ (3)

तदनुग्राहकं तत्त्वं कलाख्यं तैजसं हरः ।
मायां विक्षोभ्य कुरुते प्रवृत्त्यङ्गं परं हि तत् ॥ (4)

तेन प्रदीपकल्पेन तदाच्छन्नचितेरणोः ।
प्रकाशयत्येकदेशं विदार्य तिमिरं घनं ॥ (5)

कल इत्येष यो धातुर संख्याने प्रेरणे च सः ।
प्रोत्सारणं प्रेरणं सा कुर्वती तमसः कला ॥ (6)

इत्येतदुभयं विप्र संभूयानन्यवत् स्थितं ।
भोगक्रियाविधौ जन्तो र्निजगुः कर्तृकारकं ॥ (7)

एवं व्यक्तक्रियाशक्तिं दिदृक्षु र्गोचरं दृशः

भजत्यनुग्रहापेक्षां स्वयं द्रष्टुमशक्नुवन् ॥ (8)

तदर्थं क्षोभयित्वेशः कलामेव जनिक्षमां ।
तत्त्वं विद्याख्यमसृजत् करणं परमात्मनः ॥ (9)

तेन प्रकाशरूपेण ज्ञानशक्तिप्ररोचिना ।
सर्वकारकनिष्पाद्यमभ्येति विषयं परम् ॥ (10)

तदभिव्यक्तचिच्छक्तिर्दृष्टार्थोऽप्यपिपासितः ।
नैति तज्जनकं रागं तस्मादेवासृजत् प्रभुः ॥ (11)

स तेन रञ्जितो भोग्यं मलीमसोऽपि स्पृहन् ।
आदत्ते न च भुञ्जानो विरागमधिगच्छति ॥ (12)

इति प्रवृत्तः करणैः कार्यारूढैस्सभीवनैः ।
भोगभूमिषु ना भुंक्ते भोगान् कालानुवर्त्तिनः ॥ (13

त्रुट्यादिप्रत्ययस्यार्थः कालो मायासमुद्भवः ।
कलयन्नास्तामुत्थानान्नियत्या नियतं पशुं ॥ (14)

ससाधनस्य भोगस्य कर्तिन्त्रतया जगुः ।
केचिन्नियामकं कर्म यदन्यदति रिच्यते ॥ (15)

भोगोऽर्थेऽस्य सर्वतत्त्वानां सोऽपि कर्मनिबन्धनः ।
कर्मैवास्तु शरीरादि ततस्सर्वं नपार्थकम् ॥ (16)

अथ देहादिसापेक्षं तत्पुमर्थप्रसाधकं ।

ततो नियतिसापेक्षमस्तु कर्त नियामकं ॥ (17)
पुंस्तत्वं तत एवाभूत् पुंप्रत्ययनिबन्धनं ।
आपूरकं प्रधानादे भौंवने रुद्रसंश्रयम् ॥ (18)
ततः प्राधानिकं तत्वं कलातत्वादजीजनत् ।
सप्तग्रन्थिनिधानस्य यत्तत् गौणस्य कारणम् ॥ (19)
ततो बुद्ध्याद्युपादानं गौणं सत्वं रजस्तमः ।
तद्वृत्तयः प्रकाशाद्याः प्रसिद्धा एव भूयसा ॥ (20)
त्रयो गुणास्तथाप्येकं तत्वं तदवियोगतः ।
एकैकश्रुतिरेषां वृत्याधियकनिबन्धना ॥ (21)
न तदस्ति जगत्यस्मिन् वस्तु किंचिदचेतनम् ।
यन्नव्याप्तं गुणैर्यैरि सैकको वा मिश्रको गुणः ॥ (22)
बुद्धितत्त्वं ततो नानाभावप्रत्ययलक्षणम् ।
परं तदात्मनो भोग्यं वक्ष्यमानार्थसंस्कृतम् ॥ (23)
भावा बुद्धेर्गुणा धर्मज्ञानवैराग्यभूतयः ।
सात्विका व्यत्ययेनैते रागमुत्सृज्यतामसाः ॥ (24)
प्रत्ययास्तदुपादानास्तेऽष्टौ नव चतुर्गुणाः ।
सप्त पंच च विख्यातास्सिद्ध्याद्या वर्गशो मुने ॥ (25)
सांसिद्धिका वैनयिकाः प्राकृताश्च भवन्त्यणोः ।
विशिष्टधर्मसंस्कारसमुद्दीपितचेतसां ।
गुणस्सांसिद्धिको भाति देहाप्रयेपि पूर्ववत् ॥ (26)
लोकधीगुरुशास्त्रेभ्यो भाति वैनयिको गुणः
समार्जितो वैनयिको मनोवाक्तनुचेष्टया ।
प्राकृतो देहसंयोगे व्यक्तः स्वमादिवोऽभवत् ॥ (27)
स्वर्गो मुक्तिः प्राकृतत्वाविघातौ ।
योनिक्रान्ति निस्यमाभिबन्धौ ।
रूपेष्वर्था वैश्यप्राकृतेषु
संपद्यन्ते संविधातः क्रमेण ॥ (28)
वश्याक्रान्तिस्तत्परिज्ञानयोगौ
भोगानिच्छा विघ्नसंघव्यपायः ।
भोगासक्ति न्यक्कृति देहलब्धिर
विघ्नश्चार्थस्तेषु सांसिद्धिकेषु ॥ (29)

CHAPTER X.

KALÂ AND THE REST.

1. From Mâyâ proceed in order, Kalâ, Kâla, Vidyâ Raga, Purusha, Prakriti, the Gunas, Buddhi, Ahankâra, Chitta, the senses, Tanmâtras, and Bhutas.

Note.—The manner in which these *tattvas* arise one from the other is this :—

From Maya—Kalá, Niyati (which is here left out but is mentioned in sloka 6), Kâla, and Purusha (which is styled here *nri* or man.)

From Kalâ—Vidyâ, Râga, and Prakriti.

Prakriti is here called *matri* or mother. It is otherwise called Mûla prakriti and Avyakta.

From Prakriti—The three Gunas *viz.*, Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas.

From the Gunas—Buddhi.

From Buddhi—Ahankâra.

From Ahankàra in which Sattva predominates—the five Jnânendriyas and Manas.

From Ahankâra in which Rajas predominates—the five Karmendriyas.

From Ahankära in which Tamas predominates—the five Tanmatras or the roots of the five elements.

From the Tanmatras—the five Bhutas or elements.

It will be observed that from Prakriti downwards this table of Tattvas is identical with that of the Sânkhya system.

2. Whatever He (Ananta) accomplishes directly (from Maya) or from other things (Kalà and the rest) for the purpose of producing bodies (for the soul,) these along with the reasons which induce Him to act so and the manner in which He acts, will be set forth here in due order.

Note.—Ananta being the director of the *asuddha, advha* or the lower creation beginning from Maya—the production of embodiments for souls according to their karma belongs to Him.

3. The soul's power of action (*Kartri* or *Kriya-sakti*) is, like the Sakti of Isvara himself, eternal and universal. But being covered up by darkness (*mala*), it never manifests itself among objects, without the Lord's grace (*anugraha*).

4. Therefore, Hara, by agitating Mâyâ, produces the gracious and resplendent tattva called Kalâ, which is the prime element in manifestation.

(Note—"Gracious", *anugrahika*, since by means of this tattva only can the Lord's *anugraha* act in removing the intense darkness of the soul's *mala* a little, and lead it up to cognizing and enjoying objects. "Resplendent," since it is positive illumination contrasted with the darkness of *mala*.

5. Then by means of that (Kalâ), as with a lamp, He makes the hidden intelligence of the soul to shine out, by removing a little the dense darkness (in which the soul is involved)

The Tamil commentator explains the darkness to be karma, but I should think it more probably refers to *Anava. Mala*.

6. The root *Kal* is used in the sense of removing (literally, counting out, and of directing. And *Kala*, is so named because it removes darkness (*mala*) and at the same time directs (or arranges the enjoyment of objects by the soul according to its *Karma*).

Note. Kalâ when it takes on the function of arranging and directing the objects to be enjoyed by the soul according to its karma is called *niyati*. Thus the Niyati tattva also has been described by this verse.

7. These two (the soul and kalâ) O Brahmana, stand together as if indistinguishable, and hold the relation of agent and instrument in enjoyment and in action.

8. Thus the soul with its power of action (*kriya sakti*) rendered manifest, desirous of experiencing all the wide range of visible things, obtains the aid of *anugraha* grace), being by itself unable to perceive.

9. The Lord then, for the sake of the soul, agitates the productive *Kalâ* and thus produces the *Vidyâ Tattvâ*, which is one of the chief instruments of the soul.

Note.—The Vidya tattva is said to bring to light the *jnana sakti* or power of knowledge, of the soul, while the Kalâ tattva is credited with removing the Mala of the soul a little and stirring up its *Kriyasakti*.

10. By this Kalâ of luminous form which stimulates the *jnana-sakti* of the soul, it perceives all such objects as can be perceived with the aid of all its instruments (senses, body etc).

11. Though by his *chit sakti* (power of vision or knowledge) which has been made to manifest itself by that (*vidya-tattva*,) the soul perceives objects, yet feeling no desire, it does not move towards them. Therefore the lord created Râga which produces its (desire).

12. Being then affected (by the influence of Râga) the soul desires and takes hold of objects, though they are impure; and enjoying them, it does not attain to indifference.

13. Thus the soul '*sri*' in conjunction with the senses, which are attached to the body and which have as their basis the effects (*i.e.* the *tanmâtras*), when it enters upon enjoyment enjoys in the worlds provided for that purpose, the objects of enjoyment, controlled by Time (*Kâla*).

Note.—This is to prove the necessity of the kâla-tattva.

14. Kâla (Time), which springs from Mâyâ, is the object corresponding to such ideas as *truti* and the rest. It is styled so because it impels (*kalayati*) (towards objects) the soul, which is controlled by Niyati from the moment when that tattva comes into existence.

Note.—Compare Unmaivilakkam verse 19, Sivaprakasam verse 22 and Sivajnana-Siddhi-Supaksha Sutra 2 verses 54—56, for a description of the so called seven Vidya tattvas, viz Kalâ Kâla, Niyati, Vidyâ, Râga, Purusha, and Mâyâ. *Truti* is the shortest unit of time, being a fourth of a *kshanika*.

The first five are called the *Puncha-kanchuka* or the five sheaths of the Purusha.

15. Some assert that because enjoyment together with all the means of its accomplishment depends upon Karma, Karma alone is the conditioning element and that any other thing (such as Niyati) is superfluous.

16. The purpose of all the tattvas is enjoyment (by the soul); and this is regulated by karma. Hence (if they carry their argument to its furthest consequences) let them accept karma alone and let all other things, body and the rest, be held to be perfectly useless.

Note.—This is a reply to the objection contained in the previous verse.

17. If it is replied that karma does stand in need of the body and the rest in order to compass the ends of the soul, then, (we can well say) let this controlling karma itself be under the guidance of Niyati.

18. From it (Mâyâ) also arose the Purusha tattva which is the cause of the idea of Purusha (or personality). It pervades all the tattvas beginning with Pradhâna and on the Bhuvana path is the abode of the Rudras.

Note.—The Purusha-tattva is that condition of the soul when its three Saktis, *ichhha, jnana* and *kriya* have emerged a little by the clearing up of the Anava Mala by the other Vidya tattvas, Raga, Vidya, and Kala respectively. It is the Pasu or soul when it is *bhogonmukha* or turned towards enjoyment or experience. Vide Sivajnana Yogi's short commentary on Sivajnana Siddhi Sutra 2, verse 56 and Chidambaranatha Muni on the Sivaprakasam, Sutra 2, verse 23.

The Adhvas or paths are treated fully in chapter 13, and it will be unnecessary to dilate upon that matter here.

19. Then he produced from the Kalâ tattva the Pradhanatattva which is the abode of the three gunas which are themselves the causes of the seven *granthis* or knots.

Note—From here begins an almost complete incorporation of Sankhya terms, which extends even to the curious classification of their *bhâvas* and *pratyayas*. Pradhana is also called in the Agama, Prakriti or Mula-prakriti, and is said to be the tattva in which the three gunas, which afterwards separate off from it are in a state of equilibrium. A distinction must be borne in mind here. The Pradhana is not, as in the Sankhya, merely a term applied to the state of equilibrium only, but a separate tattva which has within it the three gunas, which then separate off. The commentator on the Tamil work Sivaprakasam expressly mentions that the Saiva doctrine should not be confounded with the Sankhya one. He thinks that the pradhana should rather be regarded as the cause of the guna tattvas. "The seven *granthis*" comprise the five Tanmâtras, Mahat or Buddhi and Ahankara.

20. From that He produced the gunas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, which constitute the material caues

of Buddhi and the rest. Their functions such as manifestation and the rest are very well known.

21. The gunas, though three, constitute really but one tattva, since they are never separated. Their separate mention is based upon the preponderance of the functions of one (over those of the other two.)

Note.—For a detailed account see the commentary on Siva-prakasam, Sutra 2 verse 24.

22. There is not a single insentient object in the universe which is not pervaded by the (three) gunas or with which at least one guna is not mixed.

23. The Buddhi tattva, characterized by the various bhâvas and pratyayas, forms a direct object of enjoyment to the soul in conjunction with the other things to be mentioned below.

Note.—The idea conveyed by the word *bhâva* is rather a difficult one. It indicates the *condition* or *disposition* of Buddhi, or in other words one function of it. It also includes the effect produced by such condition on the body and on the wordly environment according to the law of Karma. These bhâvas are also sometimes called a guna or characterestic of Buddhi. Vide Sankhya Karika-Karikas 23 and 43.

24. The bhâvas are the qualities of Buddhi. The sattvic ones are merit, knowledge, dispassion, and power. The reverse of these, with the exceptions of Passion (which is Râjasic) are characterized by tamas.

Note.—The Sankhya Karika, curiously enough includes Raga also among the tamasic bhâvas and omits all mention of any dominated by rajas. Does this indicate that the Agama is an advancement on the Karika and as such that the Agama is later?

25. The pratyayas, perfection and the rest have those (bhavas) as their material causes. They are classified, O Muni, into groups of eight, nine, four times seven and five.

Note—The total number is thus fifty, they are described in the next chapter, in the notes to which I shall give full details.

26. These (bhavas etc) belonging to the soul, are of three kinds, innate, taught and uncultivated. That quality being whose mind is illuminated by the tendencies (*Samskara*) left by high virtue (i. e. by especially good works) and which is present in him as well after death as before it, is called innate (*Sâmsiddhika*).

Note—The classification here is similar to the one adopted by the Sankhya Karika which says that the bhavas are either *Sâmsiddhika*, *Prákritika* or *Vaikritika*. Gaudapada, the commentator on the Karika cites for the first the example of Kapila, who, he says, even when he came into existence was possessed of the four Sattvic bhâvas. For the second, *Prakritika* (essential) he points out the case of the four mind-born sons of Brahma, Sanaka and the rest, who were born with the same four qualities, by virtue of their meritorious deeds in former births. The *Vaikritika* (incidental) bhavas are those that are taught by a teacher or by experience. Thus it will be seen that in both the works the classification is not of the bhavas themselves but of their modes of origin. It is also to be noticed that the Agama includes in this classification the pratyayas also, while the Sankya karika confines it to the bhavas alone. Vachaspati Misra in his Tattva-Kaumudi interprets the Karika in a different manner, for which the reader is referred to his commentary under Karika 43.

27. That which is produced by the ordinary wordly intellect, teachers and by Sastras is called Vainayika—(taught). This Vainayika quality is obtained by the activity of mind, speech and body. The Prakrita quality is that which is manifest only as it is joined to a body, like the intelligence in dreams etc.

28. Attainment of Svarga, liberation, absorption in Prakriti, irresistible power, traversing the path of births, attainment of the hell, bondage and obstruction, these respectively result from the Prakrita and Vainayika qualities.

29. The results of the Sâmsiddhika qualities are these: obtaining the favour of a deity, attainment of the knowledge of such divinity, absence of desire of enjoyment, removal of all obstacles, desire of enjoyment, degradation, attainment of bodies, and obstacles.

Note.—We may conveniently arrange in the form of a table the substance of the two last verses.

Vainayika and Prakrita qualities.

1. From Dharma (merit) *results in*—svargam.
2. „ Jnana (knowledge)—Liberation.
3. „ Vairagya (dispassion)—absorption in Prakriti.
4. „ Aisvarya (power)—absence of impediment.
5. „ Adharma (vice)—births.
6. „ Ajnana (ignorance)—hell.
7. „ Avairagya (passion)—bondage.
8. „ Anaisvarya (weakness)—obstruction.

Sâmsiddhika qualities.

From 1.—the favour of a deity.
„ 2.—the knowledge of a deity
„ 3.—absence of desire of enjoyment.
„ 4.—removal of all obstacles.
„ 5.—desire of enjoyment.
„ 6.—degradation.
„ 7.—attainment of bodies.
„ 8.—obstacles.

Of these 8 bhavas the Agama says that 1-4 are sattvic, that 7 is Rajasic and that the rest are tamasic. As was noticed above the Sankhya Karika 23 makes the 7th also tamasic. The table here given exhibits some noticeable variations from that which can be made up from karikas 44 and 45.

Here ends the Xth Chapter.

M. NARAYANASWAMI AIYAR.

(To be continued.)

I.

UNIVERSITIES AND VERNACULARS

(By Rev. J. Lazarus B. A.)

13—10—02.

The recommendation of the Universities Commission with regard to the abolition of the Vernaculars in the University curriculam is of so radical a nature that the Government of India should permit a more or less complete discussion of the question before it makes up its mind to sanction it. The Madras University, and through it, South India, are chiefly affected by the proposed measure. Sanskrit is already compulsory in the Northern Universities, and properly so. For not only are the Northern languages, as has been frequently pointed out in these columns, Sanskrit in their origin and literature but the people themselves, excepting a small fraction of aborigines, are an Aryan population. An aptitude for the study of Sanskrit, if not its accent itself runs througth their very blood. But in South India it is just the reverse. Here out of a population of some 37 millions so far as our Presidency is concerned only about three millions are Aryan, while the great bulk of the people are purely Dravidian. To the Dravidian, therefore, Sanskrit is as much a foreign tongue as English or Latin. As a matter of fact, Tamil Grammarians invariably speak of only two languages for all India, Vadamori, the Northern tongue, *i.e.* Sanskrit, and Tenmori the Southern, ie, Tamil. Just as Bengali, Hindi, Punjabi, etc, are modern offshoots from Sanskrit, so are Telugu, Canarese, Malayalam, etc, etymologically related, not to Sanskrit, but to Tamil. It so happens that for want of assiduous culture, the non-Tamil languages can boast of no grammer, or literature of their own. This is not the case with Tamil. It is the most cultivated and polished among the Dravidian tongues. Its grammar and prosody are peculiar to itselt, while it possesses a vast original literature of its own. The well known Kural, with its 1,330 couplets, has no more than 100 Sanskrit derivatives. Tamil is as much the classic of South India as Sanskrit is of Hindustan proper. But by assigning to Tamil its place by the side of Sanskrit, I do not mean to say that the other Dravidian languages should be abolished as a University study. By no means. The recommendation, in my opinion, tolls the knell of doom for all the Dravidian languages. If the compulsory study of a foreign dead language like Sanskrit by the flower of a non-Aryan people could, indeed, afford some degree of culture and mental disclipine the loss on the other hand, would be immense and serious. In the present neglected condition of the vernaculars, it would simply be a case of the dead burying the dead. It is well known that in South India only 5 per cent can read and write their vernacular.

Then as regards the educated classes, my experience as a Tamil Examiner for the last 20 years, shows that owing to various causes the vernaculars are the most neglected subjects in the curriculam of the University. Even candidates for the M. A. degree are not free from grammatical and orthographical errors. The compulsory study of Sanskrit would thus prove only another and more fruitful source of neglect. In order to obtain an early acquaintance with Sanskrit, it would take the place of the vernaculars even in the lower classes of schools with the disastrous result that the Sanskrit craze, like the Passing craze, would spread like wild fire, and every village Dravidian, to whom the aspirate and the gutturals are unpronounceable sounds, would in vain be trying to utter Sanskrit and in this attempt at the impossible forget even his mother tongue. Thus while Sanskrit in the North has given a fresh lease of life to her daughters, here in the South she would only give a death blow to emaciated aliens. Even in Europe the tendency now a day is to discourage the study of dead languages like the classics and pay greater attention to that of modern living tongues. Though I admit that the study of classics has its special claims, my contention is that this should not be done at the expense of the vernaculars. Some 40 years ago, British graduates were blissfully ignorant of English grammar and found themselves in a most awkward predicament while endeavouring to teach it to Indian pupils. Things have considerably changed now. This is just what is needed in South India. More of the vernaculars and less of the classics ought to be our cry. There was evidently no South Indian linguist on the University Commission, or so drastic a measure would not have been recommen-

ed even with the best of intentions. Still, as a via media, I beg to suggest that very elementary Sanskrit may be prescribed as an additional subject for the F. A. and B. A. examinations, the vernaculars remaining as they are. What with an extra discipline for mthe ind and an effective aid to the pronunciation of the ever-increasing number of Sanskrit derivatives in the vernaculars, especially Tamil, such a step would eventually create a taste for the study of comparative philology, which is seldom heard of among Indian graduates. And to prevent the neglect of the vernaculars their teaching might be entrusted to trained graduates as a rule, and translation made a distinct subject with its own minimum, apart from text books and grammar. By some such compromise as this, Lord Curzon would confer a lasting boon on the South Indian vernaculars and at the same time promote the study of our northern classic.

II

(*By J. A. Sharrock Esq.*)

10—10—02.

I quite agree with Mr. Lazarus that it would be a fatal mistake to abolish the study of Dravidian language in the Madras University. Sanskrit, belonging as it does to Indo-European group of languages is of no more use from an educational and practical point of view to the Natives of the Presidency than Latin or Greek. Whereas Tamil, as the first of the Dravidian group, is a language of living importance. What is wanted is more, not less study and that, too, real study. The people of North India ought to learn Sanskrit, because their own vernaculars are related to it but for the natives of South India to do so, the exclusion of their own Dravidian tongues would be the height of folly. Many natives would be the better for learning improved methods of agriculture, but I certainly would not recommend a gold miner to devote his energies to the study of rotation of crops and the values of manures.

It is quite true that English graduates do not study English but then they learn it by the study of Latin, Greek and perhaps Sanskrit. Now if Tamil were an easy language that boys might pick up for themselves while reading for the Matriculation Examination one might be silent, but everybody knows that it is one of the most difficult languages of the world. My Munshi told me it took fifteen years hard work to learn Tamil, though it is his native tongue and he knows no other. I repeat we need more, not less study of the vernaculars. Any University stands self-condemned so long as it allows a man to write "B.A." after his name, while he cannot his own language grammatically and in good style. Even now however many graduates cannot do this, because the study of the vernaculars is neglected, a pretence at learning High Tamil is made and the candidates are allowed to scrape through their examinations with a low percentage of marks. Here, as in other matters, the University tries to do too much and so sacrifices what is of far greater importance, namely, thoroughness.

The most complete test of a language is translation. One almost despairs of getting a page of English faithfully and yet elegantly rendered into Tamil. No two graduates seem to agree as to what is good style, or what bad. One finds bombastic Johnsonese (so to speak) loaded with high-flown Sanskrit words cheek by jowl with vulgar Tamil words picked up out of the gutter. There are so-called sentences containing neither subject nor predicate. The most ordinary words are often misspelled and false *santhi* is used. It is considered a sign of cleverness to introduce words that not one educated man out of ten has ever before heard of, and to involve the sentences to such an extent that, had Dr. Johnson lived in Madras, he would have found that he was a mere child in the art of obscuring thought by means of language.

When Tamil is properly taught in our colleges, we may have less of Kamban and Manika Vasigar, but a kind of prose will be evolved which will be as correct, as elegant, as terse, and as lucid as a leader (say) in the spectator. It will be a pleasure rather than a gymnastic feat to read it. The old conservative Munshi will die a natural death. University papers will avoid like poison all tricks of memory and examiners will ruthlessly mark zero all answer papers with blunders that would disgrace a child. Specialising in such subjects will be encouraged. by reducing rather than increasing the number of subjects. In a word, education will become more permanent reality instead of being a mere temporary ladder to be kicked over the moment the hood is assumed ; the last word of

the Convocation Address is uttered and the foot placed on the lowest ring of the other ladder called the Government service.

III

(By Mr. G. Padfield).

7—10—02.

There is one other point, which deserves the attention of Government, but which the journalistic critics have damned with faint praise,—the neglect of Indian vernaculars. The enthronement of Sanskrit at the cost of Indian vernaculars facilitates the promotion of learning among the Brahmin classes and renders it hard for a non-Brahmin to cope with them. It is true that a Sanskrit has a vast literature of its own, and that much of the history and learning of Ancient India may be disclosed by a study of that literature. But in this Presidency Tamil is a language widely spoken and most assiduously cultivated and as an extensive literature. The history of South India cannot be perfect unless vast treasures of Tamil literature are laid under contributions. This fact was pointed out to the commission by the great missionary teacher, I mean the Honorable Rev. Dr. Miller C. I. E. In spite of his weighty evidence it has been thrown out of the courses of study for University Examinations by the wise Commissioners. The testimony of Rev. Dr. Pope of Balliol College, Indian Institute Oxford, who has devoted his life to Tamil may be called by the Government as regards the vastness and antiquity of Tamil literature. If the Government will approve the recommendation of the Commission the Indian vernaculars will be forgotten in course of ime and the extinction of vernaculars will do immense injury to the national life of the people as English can never become their vernacular.

IV

(By A. C. Narainswami Iyer, Esq., Pleader, Kombakonam.)

THE ABOLITION OF VERNACULARS.

"This will seriously injure the spread of knowledge among the people by means of a new and modern vernacular literature. Moreover the Tamil language has a literature which is quite as classical as the literature in Sanskrit and has proved quite as efficient as the latter as a, instrument of literary training."

V

(By P. P. A.)

20—10—02.

The controversy that is going on through the papers about the recommendation of the Universities' Commission as regards Sanskrit being madea compulsory subject unfortunately turned upon the comparative merits of vernaculars, especially Tamil on the one hand and Sanskrit on the other. The "comparative merits" is not itself a primary factor in the selection of our problem. Utility and economy constitute much more important factors than the comparative merits of Sanskrit and vernaculars in deciding if the recommendation of the commission is promising of good or disappointing. Admirers of Sanskrit speak of its antiquity, of its valuable and immense literature, of the loftiest ideas and noblest thoughts that are contained in it. I do not see why at the same time they ignore the fact that the vernaculars owing to inevitable contact with Sanskrit literature, have not only to some extent assimilated the ideas, the thoughts and sentiments of Sanskrit literature, but possess in common with it the same epics, the same stories and the same legends for their themes. The Vernaculars therefore have profited as much as can be expected from the works of Sanskrit literature. The Pandits and student's eyes are now open to the grand vista of Sanskrit literature and we can rest assured that gradually all good works in Sanskrit will have their reproductions is all vernaculars. If we want progress, yes, we have been progressing though slowly and we have only to look to English literature for more ennobling and enriching the vernacular literatures.

The argument that whereas the study of sanskrit has marvellously, devoloped the several languages of Northern India, the same possibility of enrichment and development is open for those of South-India, is not, as has been somewhere pointed out, applicable here. For where there is a close attachment between a language as Sanskrit and the Hindi, the Bengali and the Mahratti, assimilation of whatever is nobler and grander in the former by the latter is possible. But, in the case of languages that have had independant existence as Tamil and Telugu, it is probable that instead of the desired result, arrest of any growth if not gradual extinction will take place.

Moreover there is not much benefit in compelling all students to study a dead language, though we respect it as an invaluable inheritance or ages of ages of thought and experience. We can no more make it a medium of speech and sympathetic address than the English-man can make Latin or Greek his. Whatever good is there in Classics, we get for our advantage by means of translations in readable living languages by scholars of the Classics, of whom enough number will be found at all times and in all places.

Nor is it a proper reason to say that, because vernaculars are not satisfactorily taught that it would be the best thing to do away with them. Our aim must be improvement upon existing systems, but not destruction when there is every possibility that much more benefit is desirable from the former than from the latter. As it has been wisely pointed out by one of your Trichinopoly correspondents, the fault lies not upon the languages themselves but upon students who rest content with knowing the meaning of words, because the examiners test them largely upon that. The remedy lies certainly not in abolishing the vernaculars as compulsory, but establishing improved methods of examination, in a wiser selection of Text books and last but not least, in raising the salaries and qualifications of Vernacular Pundits.

VI

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri and Mr. G. Perdfield.

8—10—02.

On page 492 of the Educational Review for September, Mr. Srinivasa Sastri makes an eloquent plea for the compulsory study of Sanskrit and brands those who oppose the exclusion of the vernaculars as "alarmists." Not satisfied with this he, with his characteristic cynicism, looses a parthian shaft at the changed attitude of the Madras Mail with reference to the occupation of the Pundits and adds that "a full consideration of the question would require a long article," but that he would "clear a few misapprehension that needlessly cumbured the discussion." While I eagerly await his long article I, for one who is credited with some knowledge of Tamil considered as one of the Dravidian language propose here an examination of his attempt, at clearing the misapprehension that needlessly (in his opinion) cumber the discussion. First, the Commissioners have emphatically expressed their desire that all pupils, even those that now study some classical language, should receive a thorough grounding in their vernaculars. This desire of the Commissioners, is indeed laudable; but the question is if a candidate for the School Final Examination, however high its standard, can have that grounding in the vernaculars which will enable him to make a study of the ancient classics of the Indian vernaculars. It is surprising that Mr. Sastri, who daily comes into contact with High School Students and examines them, has not come to know that even when the vernacular text books are to be studied compulsorily, boys neglect them and try to make up the minimum by a little more attention being paid to their translation papers. The same applies to the College Students and many of them pass their examinations with very little knowledge of their texts or grammer—a state of things much to be deplored. While this is the case, what better discipline can the recommendation of the Universities commission afford when it is said that the vernaculars are not completely dropped from the scheme but that the taste acquired in the schools will be kept up and improved in the College, inasmuch as there are translation papers to test the competency of graduate and under graduate candidates in their vernaculars? Mr. Sastri says that "Sanskrit besides its value as an ancient language and as containing a noble literature, has special claims on all Indians, non-Brahmins as well as Brahmins being the embodiment as it were of Hindu civilisation and the fountain head of vernacular literatures." I concur with him in respect of its antiquity and of its vast lore, but I differ from him altogether in his statement that it is the fountain-head of the vernacular literatures. His statement applies to Bengali and kindred dialects in the North, and Telugu, Malayalam and Kanarese in the South. But it does not apply to Tamil. The genius of Sanskrit are entirely different, and Tamilians will take a long time to adapt themselves to the study of Sanskrit, Europeans however learned they may be in the languages of the East, are far from getting at the ring of the vernacular verse supposing that Tamilians take all the trouble to enunciate and articulate Sanskrit properly, what do

they gain? If they read Sanskrit at all, it must be for the ideas in that literature.

Can we not get at the ideas without breaking the hard shell of the Sanskrit language? What Sanskritists consider great works, works primed with wisdom and knowledge, have been and are being rendered into English, and these translations by eminent scholars may be perused with profit and pleasure. Besides, in England, the tide has turned against the exclusive importance attached to Latin and Greek, and America fares well without them. To the Tamilians of India, what better classical language can there be than English which they study heart and soul? The Englishman studies Greek, not that he loves it but that it is forced on him as a remnant of the absorbing medical influence. The Native Christian takes to Latin, "not kindly," but from motives of prudent utility. The attainments of the latter, excepting prodigies, are merely nominal, even when he takes the B. A. degree. Again, Sanskrit literature does not embody all Hindu civilisation; it does only the Aryan. If one desires to have a peep into the civilisation of the Tamils, one must go to Tamil literature, which is no less ancient, noble, and vast than the so-called classical Sanskrit, in spite of the loss by time and tide of the Tamil libraries 1800 years ago. Mr. Sastri's concluding but not conclusive argument is that the Vernaculars have *everything* to gain from this new renascence of Sanskrit learning. This is too presumptuous; and that a pronouncement made by me, whose knowledge of Sanskrit literature is but little, is audacious and of little worth, goes without saying. I pity the Sastri who styles himself a Tamil graduate without being aware of the nobility, antiquity and vastness of Tamil literature. It is pardonable on the part of the Commissioners that none of them have an adequate sense of the noble literature of the Tamils. But it is unpardonable in the case of the Sastri, whose mother tongue is Tamil, but who is led away by that fatuous fire of an enthusiasm for Sanskrit study.

VII

SANSKRIT *vs.* VERNACULARS. 1-11-02.

In the *Madras Mail* of the 29th October, Mr. S. M. Natesa Sastri, while attempting to prove the supreme importance of Sanskrit, has allowed his zeal for it to outrun his discretion, and has made an astounding revelation of his ignorance of the antiquity of the Tamil language and literature. He has the audacity to say that "by careful study and comparison we can trace *every* Tamil word to its Sanskrit origin." Mr. Sastri is a Brahmin and, I believe, wears the holy thread. May I ask him to prove with the aid of all his philological gymnastics, if the Tamil word for "thread"—that is, *nool*—can be traced to Sanskrit origin? Leaving aside individual words, which are purely Tamil, I challenge him to trace any of the words in the following precepts of the great poetess Avvai to Sanskrit:—*Arram cheya virumbu*; *Aruvathu sinam*; *Eyalvathu karavel*; *Evathu vilakkel*, etc. If the learned Pandit-Sastri will exercise his ingenuity to work out false etymologies, he will suffer the fate of Horne Tooke, whose Diversions of Purley are well-known for the quixotic history of words they contain. I would then refer him to the severe exposure of Pandit Savariroyan of the fanciful etymologies of Tamil words given by the author of the Dravidian Philology, who is now no more.

In a former letter of mine on the Indian vernaculars, I have shown the indebtedness of Tamil to Sanskrit; but Mr. Sastri seems bent upon destroying the independent existence of Tamil altogether. Tamil is of two kinds, Shen Tamil and Kodun Tamil, or Literary and Colloquial. The classics of Tamil literature show how the literary Tamil, in spite of the ravages of time and the formidable invasion of Sanskrit, has maintained a high standard of purity. It is only the colloquial Tamil that differs in different places. Climate, food, and environment affect a language in various ways. The Tamil spoken in Java and Borneo is not the same as that spoken on either bank of the Coleroon. The effect of bilingualism need not be adverted to. The juxta-position of Telugu and Tamil, or Malayalam and Tamil, or Kanarese and Tamil, or English and Tamil-speaking races has considerably influenced the spoken Tamil. But the literary Tamil remains intact; it has its own grammar and its own vocabulary, whatever the influx of words from Sanskrit, Hindustani, or English. It is the tendency of growing Tamil to absorb foreign words with a little modification in their forms or terminations; but it will take long time before the foreign words find

their way into Tamil literature and are accepted by the Tamil writers with the *honor et privilegium* of purely Tamil words. The influence of English on Tamil is perceptible in the manner in which English words have come to be employed by the country boors in India, and in the Tamil literature that is being produ cedby the English educated Tamilians. In the face of such glaring facts, what does the Sastri mean when he says that "It is *only* Sanskrit that can improve our vernaculars and make them useful languages" ? His statement that "Our vernaculars are *as much* connected with Sanskrit as the vernaculars of Bombay and Bengal" is so absurd and untrue on the face of it that it requires no repudiation at all.

Mr. Sastry goes on the lines of the Universities Commission Report. None of the Commissioners had any knowledge of Tamil, and it is no wonder that they did recognise the importance of Tamil. I trust that the Madras University will make a full representations of the independent character of the Tamil language and literature and help its renascence. If this be not done, Indian boys to whom Sanskrit is quite foreign, will find it a great hardship to learn it along with English, another foreign language, which latter they study mostly as a bread-winning language. It is all right for men of means and leisure if they read and cultivate other literatures and languages for the mere love of them. But to compel the Tamil boys to study two new languages at the same time is to make them despair and to run them down on the march of social advancement. Even in England the Universities require only one other language to be studied with English.

G. PADFIELD.

Octacamund, 31st Oct.

VIII VERNACULARS.

Sir,—Mr. S. M. Natesa Sastry holds that Tamil is derived from Sanskrit. To put the matter plainly, he says he could derive every Tamil word from some Sanskrit root—by what process he only knows. He gives two examples of words that are traceable to Sanskrit roots and which have undergone much change in their passage into the Vernaculars. Could he derive all the Tamil words in the same way ? He says he could. From what Sanskrit roots can he derive the Tamil particles ? Again, from what Sanskrit roots can he derive such ordinary words as *arisi* and *vidu* ? In fact, his theory has already been admitted to be false by its staunchest supporters. The late lamented Professor Seshagiri Sastriar admitted so much when he failed to publish the latter portions of his Philology. The strong opposition which the publication of his first volume evoked, and his failure to meet the same, would have shown any body in close touch with modern thought that the days of the old theory are gone. It is only unfortunate that Pandit Natesa Sastry should still stick to it. What sort of affinity is there between Sanskrit and Tamil Grammar ? One grand division of Tamil Grammer, 'Porul,' has nothing in Sanskrit to trace to. How then could Tamil be derived from Sanskrit. No body denies that Tamil owes much to Sanskrit. But Sanskrit influence has not been an unmixed good to Tamil. Tamil has been stereotyped by that influence, and much of the periphrasis he refers to in Tamil owes its origin to the same source. He speaks then of the simplicity and directness of the ancient classics. The statement will be correct if taken absolutely. But he says below that he means Sanskrit by classics. Anybody who will condescend to read (even only skip through) the ancient Tamil classics, such as Purananuru, Patthupattu, Chilappathikaram, Manimahelai, etc., will find the same simplicity and directness in the long-forgotton Tamil classics as well. Still another defect in the Vernaculars is the want of perfection of literary form and artistic finish. How could he make this charge when he knows of the popular Kural ? And Kural is but an instance of such works found in abundance in ancient Tamil.

It seems Mr. Sastry speaks of the later works only, *i.e.*, works beginning from Jevaka Chintamani. These are based on Sanskrit models, and Sanskrit influence is to be found in the phraseology, structure of peotry, order of words and what not. For the last seven or eight centuries or even more the same influence has continued. The effect of it is the same as that of the French literature on the English literature of the 17th and 18th centuries. The present stagnant character of the Tamil language is due to that influence. Only quite lately Tamil has begun to be a little progressive through the

influence of English, not Sanskrit. This is patent to any ordinary observer of the times. Even now authors do not follow Sanskrit models but English models. The best works of the last decade or two have gone back to centuries and taken to the metre, etc. of the ancient classics. One has only to go to such widely known works as Professor Sundaram Pillay's "Manonmaniyam" and Mr. Suryanarayana Sastry's "Thanippasuratthokai" to be at the truth of the above statement. Still our Pandit will hold that Sanskrit influence is the only thing that can possibly regenerate the fallen Tamil language.

Next he says that other Presidencies have benefited by making Sanskrit a compulsory language, and so will our Presidency if the same be done here. It has been shown above that Sanskrit is not the mother of Tamil as it is of the Northern languages. So what obtains in the North cannot be expected to obtain here also by making the proposed change. Nearly half of the students attending the College classes even now study Sanskrit. What have they done to improve the vernaculars? Are they waiting to have all their fellowstudents study Sanskrit along with them? One of our Pandit's arguments is that Sanskrit only could supply technical words to translate the Western sciences into the vernaculars and so Sanskrit ought to be made compulsory. Connot the Sanskrit words be borrowed without every student being forced to study Sanskrit? Is the process of borrowing so difficult?

Mr. Pandit easily passes over the comparative disadvantage entailed on the non-Brahmin by the projected process. He himself admits that at the first instance the non-Brahmin will be at a disadvantage. Why should he be forced to labour under this advantage? Is the curriculum in any way advantageous to the non-Brahmin already? I suppose our Pandit does not mean so. Then in these days of keen competition, not for any thing else, but for self-preservation, what other advantage can the non-Brahmin get as a set-off against this? In conclusion, I can say without the fear of contradiction that Tamil students and scholars will be only sorry that so learned and judicious a scholar as the Pandit Natesa Sastry should put in his name before such a worthless and absurd article.

A TAMILIAN.

IX

A. MADHAVIAH 6—11—02.

I have read with much interest the numerous contributions to the free discussion of this subject which you have so kindly allowed in your valuable paper. My Pundit Natesa Sastriyar's is the last, and his opinions backed by his well-known name deserve careful consideration. I am entirely at one with the learned pandit in his rightly ignoring the caste bias brought to bear on the subject and in his estimate of a classical language, like sanskrit, as a trainer of the mind. Here I must stop, for, I cannot follow him farther in his arguments and inferences. The vernaculars have no scientific terms because the physical sciences were not the *forte* of the people speaking them, and when those people did begin to learn these sciences, it was through English. The late professor Sundram Pillai, M. A., of Trivandram who has written a Tamil prose work on the classification of the sciences and also contributed some articles on elementary general, biology in Tamil to the Vivekachintamani, has proved beyond doubt the possibility of coining suitable terms in Tamil for scientific ideas. I remember one of the terms coined by the learned professor. He expressed "reproductive power" in plants and animals by the coined phrase "Pirkilaiyakkam," a most apt and suggestive one. By the pandit's own analogy, we have to presume that every one who reads scientific work in English, must of necessity be a scholar in Greek and Latin, for it is those languages which have given English its scientific terms. This is palpably absurd, and I cannot conceive why a few scientific terms could not be borrowed from Sanskrit, if necessary, without every one of us reading that language. In fact, there are so many Sanskrit words current in the vernaculars (and the Pandit would have us believe that there is no such thing as a pure Tamil word at all) and we all understand and use them now without being Sanskrit scholars. We are told that we have no scientific publications in our vernaculars owing to "the deficiency in their knowledge of sanskrit" among our graduates. This, if true. is a great slur on the hundreds of science graduates who have studied sanskrit as their second language, and it may be some consolation to some Tamil graduates that there are others also in the same boat with them, as regards know-

ledge of the second language. The arguments advanced lead only to one conclusion; that all the three languages, Englich, Sanskrit and the Vernacular should be made compulsory. The dialectical peculiarities next referred to are inevitable with any vigorous language spoken over a large area and the vast mass of English literature has not so stereotyped that language as to eliminate all such vagaries in "English as she is spoke." I cannot understand why this should trouble any one, as such peculiarities rarely affect literature proper. Then comes the most astounding proposition that "each and every word in our vernaculars can be traced to Sanskrit" and "that we can trace every Tamil word to its Sanskrit origin."

The argument for this seems to be based on the Tamil proverb that in a pot of rice it is enough to see whether any one grain is well cooked. If the proposition is true and if the learned pandit or any one else will kindly "trace every Tamil word to its Sanskrit origin," and it is certainly worth the trouble of a life-time, he will earn the last ingratitude of all Tamilians. I once came across an eccentric gentleman who asserted that the Tamil was the mother of all languages in the world, and he proved it by the fact that even cattle spoke only Tamil, for did they not call out Amma (mother) distinctly. Add to this, he had a knack of tracing to its Tamil origin any word in any language that was proposed to him. We were talking in front of a hospital and so I asked him to account for the word "Hospital." He thought for a moment and at once answered that it was derived from two Tamil words Asufault or evil and so disease; and pidari-back of neck (*i. e.*) a place for necking out disease. Then I proposed the word "pyramid" and it proved quite simple, for it was only a slightly modified form of the Tamil words Periyamodu or high mound. If you did not feel convinced after this, certainly it was your own fault. The contention of the vernacularists is mistaken by the pandit; it is not the introduction of Sanskrit will tend to discouarge vernaculars, but, that the abolition of the vernaculars will produce that result inevitably.

I shall notice only one more statement, the last one in fact. The learned pandit says that "unless one is well acquainted with classics (Sanskrit) he can never dream of writing anything good in the vernaculars." I shall not ask how much of the classics was known to Shakespeare and other writers who have written what the world deems good without classical scholarship; I shall only ask how much of good Tamil prose our modern Sanskrit scholars have given us here. A Brahmin's Tamil and a Sudra's Sanskrit are proverbially bad and a brahmin student of Tamil, though ignorant of Sanskrit, feels the force of habit while writing Tamil and uses several Sanskrit words, not always to advantage. And as for Tamil Translations of Sanskrit work published by Sanskrit scholars, well, generally, they are more or less unintelligible to non-brahmin purely Tamil students and they largely abound in peculiarities—not to say errors—of grammar and Idiom. I can only say that the claim has not been made good, to pass unchallenged.

I am well aware it is easier to criticize than to propose anything practicable. It is also noteworthy that while so many have stood up for Tamil not a voice has been raised for other vernaculars. It is anomalous enough to have only one university with the vernaculars for the degree examinations, without having only one such vernacular while at least four are largely spoken in the land.

The only way out of the difficulty seems to be to make Sanskrit compulsory and retain the vernaculars as one of the optional subjects, requiring a high degree of accurate scholarship when they are so taken up by students who may have a natural aptitude towards a study of them. This course is not free from objects but seems to be the best possible in the peculiar circumstances of this presidency.

X

Mrs. ANNIE BESANT ON TAMIL.

Pandit. D. SAVRIRAYAN. 7—11—02.

The Tamil world cannot adequately thank distinguished scholars like G. Padfield, John Lazarus, Sharrock, G. Subramania Iyer, and others, who have boldly come forward to assail the many unwarranted and fanciful opinions given out by the critics of Tamil, who seem neither to have experience nor thorough grounding in classical Tamil literature. To the many irrefutable and incontrovertible facts expressed by them to establish the claims of Tamil,

which must to a great extent silence the lovers of Sanskrit who are much carried away by prejudice and enthusiasm and attachment, allow me to add one word more. In the last Theosophical convention held at Adyar, Mrs. Besant in one of her lectures, while speaking about Jainism and its influence, incidentally made mention of the nobility, universality and complexity of the Tamil tongue. In her opinion Tamil could boast of the Nannul of *Pavanandi*; a Tamil grammar by a Jain which was the most logical and systematic grammar she ever saw. For the universality of its literature she instanced the inimitable *Kural* of *Thiruvalluvar* which on account of the gems of thought it contains and the universal nature of its teachings is claimed by all nations of the world, the English, French, German, Protuguese and Italian as theirs. Such a testimony to the greatness of Tamil borne by this distinguished scholar of Sanskrit with whose scholarship and deep insight in that tongue our Pandits and Sastris can very well vie, must have great weight in establishing the relative importance of Sanskrit and Tamil and must once for all close the mouth of prejudiced and jealousy. This is not the place to enter into Philological discussions to prove the independent character of the Tamil language. Suffice it to say that the curious views now entertained about Tamil and its being derived from Sanskrit are only the outcome of the long neglect to study the Tamil language deeply and well. I am sure a proper scientific and thorough study of cassical Tamil will bring to light many interesting facts about one of the most ancient and civilised nations of the world and help a great deal the work of the Historians of South India, which is yet to be done. I hope the Madras University will not fail to recognise the extreme importance of the South Indian vernaculars,—which also play a prominent part in the science of Philology in this direction and make a proper representation when their opinion is called for, not so abolish them from the curricula of studies but to provide for more advanced teaching than is hitherto done.

Trichinopoly, 5th Nov.

XI

Sanskrit *vs.* Vernaculars.

G. PADFIELD.

In the *Madras Mail* of the 11th November, Mr. Krishnamacharya has, I am glad, accepted the challenge and come forward as the champion of Mr. Natesa Sastri and would have me try conclusions with him. Were he the accredited representative of the Sastri, I should, by the laws of chivalry, see to the quality of the acceptor of the challenge before I break lances with him. If the challenge should come, I might call on him to make good his vaunt or yield. The opening paragraph of the champion's reply betrays his ignorance of the *raison d'etre* of my reply. Mr. Sastri had conjured up two phantoms of Tamil words and laid them low by his philological exorcism. I was obliged to pitch my answer in the same key and challenged him to trace the Tamil word *nool* to Sanskrit, being fully aware that the Brahmin puts on the thread held to be holy or consecrated by his *mantram*. In reply to the challenge, Mr. Krishnamacharya says that *nool* is a contraction of *nurral* derived from *nuur*, *nur* or *noor*, a strange transformation of *thutr*, *tutr* or *sutr* (as in the word *sutra*.) This is certainly a fanciful etymology, half doubted by the author of it. I would urge Mr. Chari to bear in mind the basic principle of philology, that an etymology, based on mere sound is always unsound, and not to fritter away his energies in establishing false etymologies. Mr. Chari, who professes a knowledge of Sanskrit, dervies *arram* from *arya*. I know that *aram* is a Sanskrit indeclinable, meaning "soon" and that *dharam* is the common word in Sanskrit for "virtue" or "duty." Had he traced the word to the Sanskrit root *ru*, to go, there might be some sense, as the Tamil word *arram* means "that which cuts away (sins)," from *arru*=to cut. Again, he would have *arruvadu* from Sanskrit *ahri*, to take away; but the word *arruvadu* is but *arru-vadu*, a derivative from *arru*=to cut.

I might cap Mr. Chari's citations with the equally fanciful relationships of the words given below. Tamil *kali*, English *clay*; Tamil *urul* English *roll*; Tamil *panai*, English *pan*; Tamil *veru*, English *vary*, etc, Such would be the hobby of Sanskrit fanatics who, like the base Turk, would have no brother near the throne. The "mystical triad" so ably advocated by Professor Max Muller, was exploded and has become a thing of the past. Mr. Chari, who has girded us his loins to establish that Tamil is the offspring of Sanskrit, is the cat that closes its eyes when it laps milk and fancies the world to be dark. To his narrow vision, the smattering knowledge he has of Sanskrit looms big and bids fair to swallow up the *quantum* of lear-

ning that others may have of other tongues. . . . . It is true that a literary judge must be master of at least a few languages, but Mr. Chari, as is evident from the Sanskrit derivations given above, is master of none. I know at least two classical languages, besides English and Tamil, and something of Sanskrit, and I am not a special Pleader of Tamil. My acquaintance with Irayanar's "Agapporul" and with other classics in Tamil led me to consider Tamil and Sanskrit as sister tongues claiming a common origin. It is the tradition of Tamil Literature; and Pavanante, the great Tamil and Sanskrit scholar of the tenth century A. D., has confirmed it. Who is now the fool that has rushed in where angels have feared to tread? Or to use the figure of Shakespeare who is the wren that has made prey where eagles not dare to perch? What follows is Pope's description of critics of Mr. Chari's kidney: "The bookful blockhead, ignorantly read, with loads of learned lumber in his head, with his own tongue still edifies his ears, and always listening to himself appears."

Ootacamund, 13th Nov.

XII

S. KAILASAM AIYAR B.A.

28—11—02.

Much of what has been written about the Vernaculars is beside the point. The question before the public is whether the grounds on which the Universities' Commission has recommended their abolition in S. India are sufficient and raitonal. It is not for us to decide the superiority, &c. of the classical languages over the vernaculars, or *vice versa*. One of the reasons the Commission urges is that they are allied to Sanskrit. It is true so far as the North Indian vernaculars are concerned; but the languages of the Dravidian group have not much affinity and bear little resemblance to the Indo-European family of languages. Tamil is not cognate to Sanskrit, and it is as distinct from it as Hebrew is from Latin. In the opinion of the Commission the vernaculars cannot boast of any extensive literature. It has been from time to time observed in your columns that Tamil has a pure and chaste literature, and there are some works in this language which can be favourably compared with the best classical works. What are most admired in Sanskrit have been already borrowed by the Tamils and at times the translations have excelled the originals. A close and impartial examination of *Ramayana* and *Nished* in both the languages will reveal to an unprejudiced mind that there are beauties in Tami literature which are not visible in the works of Valmiki and the King of Kashmir.

Tamil is a spoken language and has attained a very high stage of development. It can be safely used as a vehicle of thought capable of assimliating modern ideas. Scholars like Pope, Caldwell and others bear testimony to the excellence of the Tamil language, its literature and philosophy which has an antiquity as old as that of the Latins and the Greeks. In them are embodied the civilisations of the Dravidians, peculiar and distinct from the Aryan; and it can be easily shown that the Aryans themselves are much indebted to the Tamilians. Much that is not found in Latin and Greek, but peculiar to Sanskrit alone, is due to the contact of the Aryans with the Tamilians. Sanskrit has adopted some of the Tamil sounds and alphabets and also has words and phrases which are not of Aryan origin. In the judgement of the late Professor Seshaghiri Sastriar, there are religious works in Tamil literature which far outshine the Sanskrit ones. Some of the customs and ceremonies of the Dravidians have found their way into the Aryan religion. Primitive Aryanism (*i e.*) the religion of the Vedas, is not affected; but in its later developments we find, the Professor says, traces of South Indian influence. The ethical code of the Tamils which has found its expression in the immortal works of Thiruvalluvar is unrivalled either by ancients or moderns. It has also a scientific grammer, most accurate and logically written out. The five great epics can be placed by the side of Dante, Milton and Homer. Works of Thayumanavar which are ballad-like, repeated by every street boy, contain much noble and hidden truth. The works and compilations of the Academies of Madura, when in their height of glory, are inimitable. A study of these works will highly train the minds of the readers and develop their faculties. An exclusive study of Sanskrit or other classical languages apart from Tamil whose literature, philosophy and religion have peculiarities of their own, will tend to retard the progress of the Dravidian people and deal a death-blow to the improvement of the South Indian

Vernaculars on which alone the future of the unique nation of S. India depends. Thus far it has been briefly pointed out that vernaculars of S. India are not allied to the Sanskrit language and that they contain a rich literature of their own, and as such the Commission is not warranted to recommend its abolition and the reasons they have assigned fall to the ground.

XIII

A TAMILIAN

17—11—02

In your issue of the 7th November, "J. M. H." makes some remarks, one or two of which I feel bound to reply to. He would put classical Tamil and Sanskrit in the same category with regard to spoken Tamil. This is quite incorrect and will, I fear, mislead many who have not had any close touch with classical Tamil. As far as I could see most of the difference between classical Tamil and modern Tamil is due to the following causes:—Change and disappearance of several old constructions, introduction of a few new constructions, disappearance of many old particles some of them word-particles), disapearance of provincialisms, especially those found in works written in Cheranadu, and above all the borrowing of a very large number of Sanskrit words. Such changes are, I believe, quite natural to every living language. If "J. M. H." doubts my statement above, I will have only to request him to compare some of the first odes in *Purananuru*, which are perhaps the oldest Tamil literature we have got, with any modern Tamil literary work he may choose. As to spoken Tamil will always to some extent differ from literary Tamil even as spoken English differs from literary English "J. M. H." next says that the present imperfection in he Tamil vocabulary can be set right only by Sanskrit study as there are a large number of Sanskrit words in Tamil. This statement is due to an incomplete understanding of the Tamil language. Our exeprience hitherto has been that Sanskrit students who wrote in Tamil always introduced too many Sanskrit words unnecessarily. The classical example for this is Villiputhurar. Many of the words he has used have not yet gained currency in Tamil.

Lastly comes the question of the progress of the Vernaculars and the progress of the people. Hitherto most of those who have come forward to write in Tamil have been those who studied Tamil in the schools and Colleges. The journals and newspapers have been started, conducted and contributed to by the same sort of men, even though there be as many outside who have studied Sanskrit in schools and Colleges. So it is quite a speculative matter to expect the Sanskrit students to come forward to do the work. Nor can they do it, when they have got two languages, which have got nothing in common with Tamil except a few words to be studied in the College. As to the education of the people at large "J. M. H." says that they ought to be taught by means of journals and newspapers. I have shown above that the journals and newspapers cannot be expected to be conducted by Sanskrit students, so the result of the abolition of the Vernaculars from the University curricula would be a dead stop in the progress of the Vernaculars as well as in the progress of the people at large.

XIV

Sanskrit *vs.* Vernaculars.

J. A. S. Trichinopoly 12—11—02

The efforts that Messrs. Natesa Sastri and Krishnamacharya are making to prove that Tamil is derived from Sanskrit are really most interesting. The definition (it is Professor Max Muller's, is it not?) that "Etymology is a science in which the consonants count for very little and the vowals for nothing at all, makes their task a comparatively easy one. I shall not interrupt them in the pursuit of so sublime a study, but I should like to point out how easily this scientific investigation might be carried a step further, and the fact demonstrated that English is derived from Tamil. I must not take up too much of your space, and so I will confine myself to one simple illustration, availing myself of course of the latitude allowed by the above-mentioned definition. Tamil people speak of a *goat* as *kochai* and *adu*; now dropping off the suffixes peculiar to Tamil, and changing *k* into *g*, we get *goch-ad* left. This would easily be shortened into *go-ad* or *goat*. This derivation may be supported (if necessary) by appearing to the fact that while *adu* as a noun means *goat*, it means as a verb *shake*, *sport*, *rush* etc. Now English people call these animals *goats* because of their tendency to *go at* one, that is, their sport is to butt. The inference is obvious and so need not be laboured. And now, having, as I trust, proved my point, that the

English word *goat* is derived from the Tamil word *adu*, it only remains for the Sanskrit philologists to prove that *adu* is derived from the Sanskrit *mesha* (which is equally simple), and the sequence will be complete.

XV

THE STUDY OF CLASSICAL LANGUAGES.

By S. K. S. 22—9—02

One of the recommendations of the Universities Commission which all chiefly affect the course of study prescribed for the candidates of the Madras Uinversity is the abolition of the vernaculars and the substitution of Classical Languages instead. If this recommendation were to be adopted, the study and cultivation of Tamil or Telugu or Malayalam will have to be given up for a scrappy and superficial knowledge in Sanskrit or Latin or Greek. The Commissioners say that having given their best consideration to the evidence placed before them on the comparative merits of classical and vernacular languages, they are inclined to prefer the Classical Languages. Even among natives of India, opinion seems to differ. Professor Lakshminarasu, speaking at the public meeting held under the auspices of the Students' Union, Black Town, to consider the report of the Universities Commission contended that the intellectual pre-eminence of India is to be secured by a close study of Sanskrit. Mr. G. A Natesan nodded assent to this proposition. Mr. G. Subramania Iyer, however, thought otherwise. We may also remark that when the commission sat in Madras, it did not show itself to be very enthusiastic over this question; and when Mr. Justice Gurudas Banerjee expressed his astonishment at what he considered to be the anomaly of a Madras student taking his degree without knowing any of the Classical Languages, many thought and firmly believed that the Rev. William Miller's reply that we, Southerners, consider Tamil as almost a Classical Language, had effectually convinced him.

We have read carefully the reasons alleged by the commissioners in having arrived at the decision; and we must confess to a feeling of disappointment that they had no more than a superficial study of the question. The three reasons given, are suggested by the able and masterly plea of John Stuart Mill set up in his address delivered to the University of St. Andrews on February 1st, 1867, in defence of giving a place to Classical Languages in a course of liberal education. Mr. Mill expresses himself in opposition to introducing the living Languages of the continent in the University; firstly because *their* Vernacular, English, is well studied and certainly not neglected, and secondly because, a study of either Latin or Greek would secure to them the key to a knowledge of half-a-dozen continental languages much more easily than without them. But in India, the classical languages will not give a key to a knowledge of Tamil or Telugu nor are the Vernaculars cultivated as *English* is in England. The Commissioners' third reason "that the study of Classica Languages is of the utmost importance for the improvement of their allied vernaculars" has no application to South India and South Indian Vernaculars.

The second reason the commissioners give is that "the amount of mental training which the study of a Classical Language ensures is much greater than that required for the study of vernacular language." Of this "mental training" or rather,, the discipline of the intellect," Mr. Mill makes much; for, says Mr. Mill, their grammars are very complicated and provide distinct forms for the greatest number or distinctions of thought, so that if we fail to attend precisely and accurately to any of these, we cannot avoid committing a solecism in language. The grammar is complicated, we admit. But we fail to understand that this "mental training," this "discipline of the intellect" could not be secured otherwise, in a more useful and practical way. A study of chemical science or mathematics would more usefully discipline the intellect and in a less objectionable manner. To secure "intellectual discipline" by artificial expansion of the complications and intricacies of the grammar of a language, is certainly not a desirable thing. It is as reprehensible as to secure the name of a good poet, by artificially increasing and multiplying the rules of poetic composition, as did the "correct school" of poets. There is also a distinction between "intellectual discipline" and "intellectual shortdrill;" and we are afraid, it is the latter which will be the direct consequence of a study of "complicated grammars." Cram and grammar are twin sisters and we are reliably informed that English students pay Latin and Greek grammars no more than the mild compliment of cram.

Perhaps the best reason is, as the Commiossiners say that "the Classical Languges containing a rich literature

and embodying a record of the thought and action of the great races of mankind" reveal to us the thought, the feeling, and the type of character of those ancient peoples without a knowledge of which our intellect must remain half-expanded. To us, Hindus, it is not absolutely necessary to have a complete mastery over Sanskrit to know "the thoughts, feelings and type of character" of the ancient Aryans. We are their lineal descendants, and although there are many who doubt and reasonably too, if we are true Aryans, it is granted that some at least of their blood runs in our veins. We can therefore understand everything of them as, indeed, we do. As for knowing the Latins and the Greeks, we can know them through the English. The European civilisation of to-day is simply a structure upon the Hellenic civilisation of ancient Greece and Rome. The laws, the social polity, and the form of Government that exist in England largely owe their origin to the institutions that flourished in those two mighty empires. And the feelings, passions, desires that rankled in the breast of the Greeks and the Romans, are the same that hold sway over the Englishman of to-day or any other civilised people on earth. The avarice of a Marcus Crassus, the revenge of an Agesilaus, the ambition of a Cæsar or Pompey, the cool, calculating, blood-thirsty knavery of a Sulla, the diplomacy of an Alcibiades, the just and noble feelings of a Cato or a Phocion, the stern and robust patriotism of a Brutus or a Dion of Syracuse or even the indifference of a Diogenes are alike the common property of mankind of every age and clime. Anybody who makes a carefull study of History and acquaints himself with men of diversified character can conceive them. Hence the absence of any necessity to learn Latin to know the Romans, to learn Greek to know the Greeks. It is true there is a difference between types of character, if by it we understand the national ideal. The Hindus who are extremely spiritualistic and hence superstitious, may not know the English without knowing their language, but the difference that subsists between the Hindu and the English does not exist between the English and the Romans or the Greeks, for their national ideal has been political advancement and material prosperity. Their ideals, their aspirations, and their ambitions and the English need not study Latin to know the Romans. And we too can learn by a study of English translations as much of the Romans and the Greeks as we show inclination to know.

Indeed, we are extremely surprised why people should be so much persistent in the matter of a language. What has a language to do with thought or culture? Is wisdom confined to the portals of a certain language? Is language anything more than a vehicle for conveying thought? Have particular language any romantic fascination for certain branches of knowledge? If two different languages have the required words which can adequately convey meaning, cannot knowledge be translated and as impressively taught in the one as in the other? We believe that language has no charm, no beauty, other than that given by the knowledge it can be the means of conveying Plato and Aristotle and Socrates would have thought the same thing and left the world the same legacy of intellectual wealth in any other than in the Greek language. The birth of an intellectual master-spirit among a people speaking a certain language is trivial and accidental, but the wisdom of life he leaves behind is invaluable and immortal. The teachings of a Jesus or a Buddha are sterner realities than the language in which they spoke. Their knowledge is not provincial or local, but Universal. The dialectics of Plato and Aristotle can be conveniently conveyed in other than the Greek language, saving the the students of the Madras University the grim necessity of making a "general acquaintance" of dead-languages.

S. K. S.

XVI

THE UNIVERSITIES AND VERNACULARS.

Sir,—Now that the proposal of the Universities Commission urging the exclusion of the Vernaculars from the B. A. curriculum has been referred to the local Senate for opinion, I beg leave to contribute my humble share to the discussion. The proposal is of such vital importance that no one with a particle of interest in the living languages of South India should let them die without uttering his note of warning and sympathy.

To begin with, the reasonableness and practicability of the proposal rests entirely on the *alliance* said to subsist between Sanskrit and the Dravidian vernaculars (see Report para. (89). If the alliance were a fact, as is the case between Sanskrit and the Northern vernaculars, the argument might hold, and some good might result from a study of Sanskrit in preference to that of Tamil, etc. But the question is, is there any such alliance between

Sanskrit and the Madras vernaculars? Professor Max Muller has divided the principal languages of the world into three families, the Semitic, the Aryan and the Turanian. And Bishop Caldwell has conclusively proved the Turanian origin of the Dravidian languages. This classification is universally acknowledged by all philologists worth the name. The fact that the Dravidian languages have borrowed Sanskrit words—or rather, to speak more correctly, that Aryan colonists have introduced Sanskrit words into the Dravidian vocabulary—can no more prove their Sanskrit origin than that English is derived from Latin and Greek because it has borrowed largely from the Classics. As a matter of fact, English is more closely allied to Sanskrit than Tamil or any other Dravidian tongue is. The recent Government Census Report adopts the true basis of classification and points out that in this Presidency 91 per cent. of the people speak Dravidian languages as against 8 who speak Aryan languages (see page 90 of volume 15). There is thus neither a blood nor marriage *alliance* between the two families. Like the physical features of the Dravidians, those of their languages are totally distinct from those of the Aryans, unless one wants to force an alliance by tracing *all* languages, as all men, to one parental source. The theory of "allied vernaculars" is a foundation of sand, and was evidently hastily formed by the Commission. The whole Presidency ought to rise in rebellion against a proposal resting on so false a foundation, and with all dealing a death-blow to its independent, living languages.

But quite apart from the fanciful basis on which the house of cards is built, I do not see how the several reasons advanced by the Commission could justify the exclusion of the vernaculars. Four reasons are urged. First, the richness of Sanskrit literature; secondly, the mental discipline its study involves; thirdly, the enriching of the vernaculars; and lastly, the expected stimulus to vernacular study. These four reasons, if they prove anything at all, prove clearly that the Commission, while elaborating this famous paragraph, had the Northern languages in their mind. The reasons apply to the *Sanskritic* vernaculars which have all benefited by a study of their ancestral tongue. The vernaculars of South India, however, have a rich literature of their own, especially Tamil, the most polished and cultivated of them all. I do not mean mere translations, but original writings dealing with Dravidian heroes and their exploits. As for the second reason, the study of the vernaculars is as good a discipline of the mind as that of Sanskrit. The Commission are not aware that classical vernacular is quite different in idiom as well as grammar from the colloquial, so much so that the common attack on the Dravidian graduate that he cannot construe a piece of ancient poetry is only too true. For the matter of that, I ask, how many Sanskrit and Latin graduates can do the same?

It is urged, again, that the study of Sanskrit would go towards enriching vernacular literature. This is as untrue of the South as it is true of the North. As it is, there are at the present time nearly 1,600 Sanskrit graduates, as against 4,500 Dravidian graduates, that is, a little more than a third. Now, who is enriching the vernaculars? Surely, not the Sanskrit graduates, who cannot on the one hand make use of their classic, nor, for want of culture, write correctly and idiomatically their mother tongue. It is the Dradivian graduates that are producing works in abundance and enriching their vernaculars which they have studied to good purpose.

Now, to take up the last reason, that the study of Sanskrit would promote the study of the vernaculars. I can only say that the remedy is worse than the disease. For the first effect of forcing Sanskrit on an alien race would be that its study would have to be begun as Latin is in the Third and Fourth Standard. It is idle to expect any student to master B. A. text books in four years. He must begin at the bottom of the scale. What chance, then, would there be for the study of the vernaculars? Instead of a salutary reform, there would spread a suicidal revolution throughout the Presidency. It would be a case of all loss and no gain. And what about the teaching? Sanskrit Pundits belong to the same family as Dravidian. The teaching would be as disreputable as it is now, while the new difficulties would be simply insuperable, by reason of the utterly foreign character of the tongue, its alphabet, and its aspirates. The Government of India might with more reason with a stroke of the pen abolish all languages and make *English* the sole vernacular of India!

In conclusion, the proposal of the Commission to combine a vernacular with English for the M. A. degree examination is a most Utopian scheme. It is a mixture of oil and water, as has been ably pointed out by Mr. Hunter. After having neglected his vernacular during something like 10 years of his School and College course, the graduate studying privately is expected in the short space of two years to obtain a *thorough* and *scholarly* knowledge of his vernacular! Let me not be misunderstood. I do not despise the study of Sanskrit. I hope the time will come when more languages than two will be studied in this University. But let not the living languages of the land be killed in the hopeless effort to revive the dead.

Madras, 31st Jan. J. LAZARUS.

XVII

THE BATTLE OF THE VERNACULARS.

The following letter from a valued contributor, a native gentleman whose name, if we were at liberty to allow it to be known, would carry great weight, will be read with interest in view of the approaching discussion which is to begin this evening in the Senate on the subject of the retention of the native Vernaculars in the University curriculum.

Our valued correspondent is a warm supporter of the retention of the Vernacular languages in the University Course, and after some remarks which we omit, proceeds as follows on "the retention of the examination in the Dravidian Languages," "which are not," he goes on, "derived from Sanskrit as the Upper India Vernaculars are, but are cultivated languages that could get on independent of the Sanskrit of the Aryan race. Of course like the English language—the Vernacular of Englishmen—the Tamil, &c., languages have a literary as well as a colloquial dialect, and are intermingled with several Sanskrit and other foreign words; but the system of borrowing words from other languages is common to all the cultivated languages of the world, and there is such a thing on High Latin and Low Latin, High German and Low German, High French and Low French, and likewise High English and Low English. The crusade against the living speech of the people is not new, as during the seventies and eighties I had to fight on their behalf along with real scholars who loved and studied the people of the Peninsula, and their mother tongues, and not despised them as the present day authorities do, from ignorance of the difficulties that surround the study of Sanskrit in three or four years, up to the standard of the B. A. degree, and the evil of making the native students learn nothing but a foreign language, (English) and a dead language, for five hours of each day, and all the week round for four consecutive years and more. Just imagine, Sir, the case of an English boy made to learn everything through Latin and French without hearing a word of English, for four or five years. Is he not likely to forget the purity and simplicity of the English speech, forget the method of idiomatic and grammatical composition in his own mother tongue, and know little of English literary style and the English authors and their works?

Dr. Richard Quain said in his Hunterian oration before the College of Surgeons that whatever might be taught, or might not be taught to the rising race of youth, "let their mother tongue be not neglected—that tongue which they lisped in the cradle in which all the concerns of their lives are dealt with, and in which they breathe their last breath of hope.

This is what the Indian authorities forget, and the idea of removing the Indian 12 cultivated languages from the University Curriculum is something that none would suggest for a moment out of India. The men of Oxford and Cambridge, Edinburgh and London; Dublin and Durham, of old, were too much accustomed to ignore all but the classics, but the tendency of the present day is to power the position of Greek and Latin in schools and extend the study of Modern Languages and Modern Science. The Old School men like Mr. Raleigh, are not an authority of Indian Languages, and native opinion and sentiment must have a preferential consideration if the Universities are Indian institutions which are bound to respect and hand down to posterity this noble and patriotic sentiment embodied in native language and literature which the present generation inherited from ancient times, and not crush them."

(*Madras Times.*)

Notes and Comments.

The October No. of the Mind, is very interesting and devoted to the proceedings at Upland Farms, the new summer school of the New Thought at Oscawana-on-Hudson N. Y. Several papers were read on the occasion and one of them "An hour with Tolstoy" will appear elsewhere in the next issue. The papers on literature for children, Brownings message to the world and some others are very interesting.

***

All Power is from the *she* side of God.

In a paper, on "Jesuitical" occultism published in the August No. the writer explains the great power exercised by the Roman Catholic Church over its adherents by the fact that "it is the only church of Christendom that recognizes the femenine quality, element or attribute in Deity, and it is by means of the deep hold on this *mother* instinct of the heart that the Roman church has that it maintains its influence over the minds of its devotees." "The Protestant church has set up a masculine God as an object of worship and is fast losing its hold on the hearts of its adherents and consequent loss of their allegiance is not far off unless this church remembers. "And all power is from the *she* side of God is an old mystic maxim of this church.

***

REALISATION.

To live is to realize our ideals, good or bad, high or low. Thus man is that which he realizes himself to

be. He is sick, poor and miserable, or he is healthy, rich and happy, if he brings into realization these states of being within himself. Realize yourself to be perfect love and you are it; realize fear and you are it; and so on. The physical body manifests that which your spirit realizes. To realize Love is to realize Heaven, and your physical body then becomes an angelic embodiment; realize Love's opposite and you embody that.

Man is that which he realises himself to be.

Man walks in fear from the cradle to the grave, because he does not realize that he is within the sheltering arms of Love and Wisdom, and all his hurts and woes and miseries are due to the inharmonies that he brings into realization through fear.

You cannot hurt your spirit—it cannot be hurt, drowned, crushed or annihilated. Your spirit is your real self. But you can hurt your flesh body through your ignorance of the laws of harmony. Your spirit is not subject to the law; it is the physical man. On the material plane you are subject to law; on the spiritual plane you are the Law.

Realizations grow by thinking. Every thought is your child that you must transform to harmony to realize happiness. If you are content to have bad mental children, they will be a source of constant annoyance and will plague and torment you.

***

Christian mission in India

Mr. Alfred Nundy contributes an interesting article on the "Present position of Christian missions in India" to the October No. of the Imperial and Asiatic Quartely Review which, on the whole does not present a very hopeful view of the picture. Among the obstacles to the success of Christians, Mr. Nundy enumerates three important factors, namely (1). That the missionaries in or outside the college or School are exercising no real power or influence over the people they come in contact with, "as they are imbued, more or less, with prejudices of anglo. Indians; and often approach the people, the wish to convert in the pride and arrogance of conquerors, with a thinly veiled contempt for a subject race," (2) that the Missionaries do not lead exemplary lives of self-denial and asceticism so as to command the respect of the Hindus and (3) and that the moral and spiritual condition of the Indian Christians is not as satisfactory as it need be. He also mentions that there is not much of love and harmony between the European Missionaries and their own congregation, (he excepts with justice the American methodists) and we would ourselves desire an improvement in their relations.

But Mr. Nundy ignores a much more important factor in the way of Christian conversion. The Hindus themselves are awakening from a long slumber, and through the agencies of the Theosophical Society and Swami Vivekananda &c., the better classes have begun to study their own religions and philosophies in a more sympathetic spirit, and find that christianity has nothing better to offer in precept or practice. There are scores of Indian magazines devoted to Indian Religion and Philosophy and hundreds of associations all round the land, when a decade or two back there were few or none. Besides the more enlightened among both the Hindus and Christians perceive the essential unity in the highest teaching of both Religions, omitting from consideration altogether the various excrescences which time, place and the natural perversity of man has introduced into their Religions. If as adherents of the Christian faith assert, there are really special points which differentiates theirs from all other religions, it is because they never devoted as much time and patience and sympathy to the study of other religions as they do their own father. They carry out never in practice the golden rule "Love thy neighbour as thyself."

***

And in the present connection we are pained to see in the pages of our contemporaries some disparaging criticisms of Christianity, which is as much the result of ignorance as the Christian attacks on Hindu Religion. And it behoves our own countrymen to move into greater homogenuity of thought and doctrine, and into higher and purer forms of life and action, rejecting all that is impure and untenable in our own dogmas.

We congratulate Pundit D. Savari Royan as a member of the Royal Asiatic Society.—He is an ardent and well-read Tamil scholar. His valuable contributions in this Journal were read with delight and interest. His orginal researches, his able defence in cause of Tamil language, literature and Philology is too fresh in our memory to need mention here. He will be an ornament to the Society to which he is now elected.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE TAMILIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

NOTICE.

The members are requsted to send their subscriptions as early as possible to our treasurer Mr. T. Veerabhadra Mudaliar B. A., B. L., High Court Vakil. Mint Street. Madrs.

Such of the members as would like to send contributions to the journal in the name of the Society are requested to send the same to Mr. T. A. Ramalingam B. A. *Secretary*, T. A. Society. C. N. Press Buildings, Broadway, Madras.

Each member is requested to send a list of books and magazines which will help the study of Tamilian History and philology and throw light on its antiquity. The approved list will be published in the journal in due course.

Proceedings of the first general Meeting of the T. A. Society.

The first general meeting of the Tamilian Archæological Society was held on Sunday the 6th of January 1903 at the Society's premises, 161, Broadway, Madras, with Mr. J. M. Nallaswami Pillay, B.A., B.L., in the Chair.

There were 13 members present on the occasion.

1. The Chairman opened the meeting with his learned inaugural address. *

2. The proceedings of the preliminary meeting held on the 26th Dec. 1902, were read and approved of.

3. Letters from the following Gentlemen accepting their election as Directors were read and ecorded :—Messrs. J. M. Nallaswamy Pillay. V. J. Thamby Pillay, M. S. Purnalingam Pillay, R. S. Vedhachalam Pillay, S. Lakshmana Iyer and S. Anavarathavinayakam Pillay and Rao Bahadur. P. I. Chinnaswamy Pillay.

4. The secretaries were asked to remind those gentlemen who have not yet written accepting their election to inform the society as to their accepting the office. It was resolved that in case if the Rao Bahadur Jambulinga Mudaliar would not accept the presidentship the Dewan Bahadur P. Rajarutnam Mudaliar be held as an alternative candidate to be asked to take the presidentship.

5. The receipt of Rs. 10 sent by Mr. V. P. Subramania Mudaliar V. G. B. C. as donation to the Society to meet the preliminary expenses was announced. The donation was accepted with thanks and it was resolved that a formal letter of thanks be sent to him in the name of the Society by the Secretaries.

6. The rules prepared by the sub-committee were read and passed with necessary additions and alterations.

7. Resolved that the consideration of the proposition to appoint a literary committee be postponed untill another meeting and resolved also that only members of the Society be eligible to form the literary committee.

8. Resolved that the Secretaries be permitted to make suitable arrangements with any one of the existing journals to utilise it as the organ of the Society and communicate the result to the Directors.

9. Resolved that the members be asked and to submit a list of books and magazines which will help the study of Tamilian History and philology and throw light on its antiquity and that after approval the list be published in the Society's organ for the information of the members.

10. Resolved that the work of the Society be commenced at once and necessary steps be taken to collect the subscriptions.

11. Resolved that the proprietors of the C. N. Press be thanked for their kindness in placing their premises at the disposal of the Society.

After a hearty vote of thanks to the Chair, the meeting was brought to a close.

MADRAS, 6th Jan. 03. (Sd.) J. M. NALLASWAMY PILLAI,
Chairman

* It will be found in another column.

The Tamilian Archaeological Society.

(*Established January* 1903)

RULES AND REGULATIONS.

I. The objects of the Society are (*a*) to help towards a systematic, scientific and critical study of the classical works of Southern India and (*b*) to draw materials for the construction of an accurate history of the people of Southern India (including Ceylon) and of their languages, literature and philosophy.

II The means to be adopted for carrying out the aforesaid objects shall be:—

(1) To produce original works on subjects included in the objects of the Society.

(2) To collect old manuscripts that have not yet come to light and print such as are worth printing and to collect and preserve as many of even published works as are worth while preserving.

(3) To form a library of such works as will help towards the achievements of the objects of the Society.

(4) To compile an etymological and philological dictionary arranged in a scientific order.

(5) To write commentaries and cirticisms on ancient classics on modern lines.

(6) To conduct a quarterly or monthly journal in the name of the Society or utilise an already existing journal for this purpose and

(7) To convene public meetings in the principal towns of Southern India periodically and to arrange for public lectures on subjects likely to promote the objects of the Society.

III. The Society shall consist of:—A board of directors, members, patrons and honorary members.

IV. (1) The management and financial control of the Society shall be vested in the hands of the Board of Directors subject to the sanction of the general body.

(2) The Board of Directors shall consist of a President, two vice-Presidents, two Secretaries, a Treasurer and twelve other members.

(3) The Board shall be elected once in two years. Should any vacancy occur among the directors during the interval, such vacancy shall be filled up by the Board.

(4) The Directors shall have power to appoint committees for specific purposes. They may also appoint paid officers to execute special duties in connection with the working of the Society.

(5) The Board of Directors shall have power to frame bye-laws for the internal management of the Society subject to the approval of the general body.

V. The Treasurer shall keep accounts, collect subscriptions, grant receipts, invest all money above Rs. 10 in banks in the name of the Society and shall withdraw sums when directed by the Board. He shall plan a statement of the receipts and charges before each meeting of the Board.

VI. The auditors shall be appointed annually from among the non-official members, and their report shall be submitted for the approval of the general body.

VII. Meetings :—(1) The Board of Directors shall meet at least once a quarter to transact business. A week's notice shall be necessary before every meeting of the Board.

(2) General meetings may be convened by the Board at its discretion or upon the written requisition of eight members of the Society.

(3) The annual general meeting of the Society shall be held in December to receive and consider a report of the Board on the state of the society, to receive the accounts of the Treasurer and the report of the auditors thereon, elect the Board and to deliberate on such other questions as may relate to the regulation, management or other affairs of the society. At least a fortnight's notice shall be given before any general meeting.

(4) The quorum for meetings of the general body shall be 7 and for the Board it shall be 4. Most of the business shall be transacted by circulation and

any matter shall be brought up before a regular meeting at the request of 3 Directors.

VIII. Members :—(1) Pandits, graduates of Indian Universities and other learned persons are eligible for membership.

(2) Applications for membership should be made to the Secretary and should be supported by at least two members of the society. They will be enrolled as members, provided a majority raises no objection in a meeting of the Directors.

(3) Every member shall pay an annual subscription of Rs. 5 which shall be due by the 31st March of every year and the Board shall have power to strike off the role, the name of any member whose subscription is more than two years in arrears. The Board shall also have power to exempt Pundit members from payment of subscriptions if necessary.

IX. Publications :—(1) The Society shall publish a quarterly or monthly journal containing papers, notes, letters etc. on subjects submitted to or discussed before, the meeting together with the procedings of the meeting of the Board or the general body.

(2) The journal of the Society shall be edited by the Secretary with the help of the literary committee and a copy shall be sent free of all costs to every member of the Society. Members requiring more than one copy may be supplied at half price. The author of any article published in the journal shall be entitled to 20 copies of such an article.

(3) Any article written by the members and published without the knowledge of the Society cannot be counted as belonging to the Society.

X. Patrons :—Patrons shall be those who will assist the Society by a donation of a sum of, not less than Rs. 100. Each Patron shall be supplied with a copy of every publication of the Society.

XI. Honorary Members :—(1) Honorary Members shall be those, who, whether they be otherwise connected with the Society or not, are chosen as such, in consideration of distinguished literary work done in connection with the objects of the Society.

(2) They shall be proposed by the Board and elected by the general body. Thee privileges of the members shall also be extended to them.

Board of Directors.

President.

M. R. Ry. N. Rathnasabapathy Pillay Avl., B.A., B.C.E.

Vice Presidents.

Rao Bahadur T. Pattabhiram Pillay Avl.

M. R. Ry. J. M. Velu Pillay Avl.

Other Directors.

Rao Bahadur P. I. Chinnaswamy Pillay Avl.

Rev. S. Gnanamutthu, M. A.

" J. Lazarus, B.A.

M. R. Ry. J. M. Nallaswamy Pillay Avl., B.A., B.L.

" G. Subramania Iyer Avl., B.A.

" V. J. Thamby Pillay Avl.

" T. Balasundaram Mudaliar Avl.

" V. G. Suryanarayana Sastriar Avl., B.A.

" S. Lakshmana Iyer Avl., B.A., [L.T.]

" M. S. Purnalingam Pillay Avl., B.A.

" S. Anavarathavinayakam Pillay Avl., M.A. L. T.

Pundit R. S. Vedhachalam Pillay.

M. R. Ry. T. Veerabhadra Mudaliar Avl., B.A., B.L. Treasurer.

Pundit D. Savariraya, M.R.A.S. } Secretaries.
M. R. Ry. T. A. Ramalingam, B.A. }

THE CHAIRMAN'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN AND FRIENDS,

By a peculiar chance, with the exception of a very few all the great Oriental scholars lived in Northern India, and they thus became acquainted with the Sanskrit Literature, and they introduced the knowledge of this literature to Europe; so for more than a century Sanskrit Literature has engaged the attention of the best scholars of Europe, so that we now find that all the researches into the past History

of India, literary, social, historical, religious and philosophical are all connected with Sanskrit. And if we, for instance, turn to the pages of Mr. R. C. Dutt's History of Ancient Civilization in India, we find the whole devoted to a history as developed by these Sanskrit scholars, and you will be surprised to find nothing in it devoted to the History of Civilization of Southern India except a couple of pages. The fault is not Mr. Dutt's, but it is due to the utter paucity of Oriental literature connected with the languages, people and civilization of Southern India.

We have of course the opinion of a few scholars like Bishop Caldwell, Rev. Dr. G. U. Pope and others who have had lived in Southern India and had studied the people and their languages, in which they express the highest admiration for the people and their past literature. And to this we may add the opinion of that Sanskrit Veteran Prof. Max Muller. In his last great work he explains himself as follows :—

"Nor should their labour be restricted to Sanskrit texts. In the South of India, there exists a philosophical literature which, though it may show clear traces of Sanskrit influence, contains also *original indigenous elements of great beauty and of great importance* for historical purposes. Unfortunately, few scholars only have taken up, as yet, the study of the Dravidian languages and literature, but young students who complain that there is nothing left to do in Sanskrit literature, would I believe find their labours amply rewarded in that field."

It is of course a happy augury of the times that this ancient country and its languages are just now engaging the attention of both Indian and European scholars and I may here cite the conclusion of one ofour formost scholars, I refer of course to the late lamented Prof. Sundram Pillai. In a review of *Tiruvarutpayan* contributed to the *Madras Standard*, he writes that "the scientific historian of India then ought to begin his study with the basin of the Krishna, of the Cauvery, the Vaiga rather than with the gangetic plain as it has now too long been the fashion."

Good deal of work has been done by Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai, Pundit Savariroyan and others, and the Government Department under the presidentship of Dr. Hultzsch is carrying out a systematic survey of the epigraphical remains of Southern India and the history of this country is thus being slowly unravelled.

Though as such there are many scholars pursuing independent investigations with the subject of South Indian History and Archæology, necessity for the formation of a Society like ours, may not be lost sight of. The foremost reason appears to me to be this that in a new field like this independent investigators are often likely to carry with them their own peculiar prejudices and angularities or hobbies, and the conclusions may therefore be in a sense vitiated. There is no critical public who will receive their account with a caution, and a society like this will be in a position to bring to bear their united powers on all questions brought before them, and anything that might go out with their approval may be in a sense accepted as being as near the truth as possible. And then, again, more work can be done by cooperation and mutual help; and we know what great work has been done by similar societies in Europe and India in the investigation of Indian, and Egyptian and Assyrian Archæology.

We may therefore begin our work with the certainty of entering on a good work and with the hope of turning out some useful work. We need not however despond at our list of members not being large and influential, our society is not intended for any exhibition or show but is strictly confined to highly important work, and we must congratulate ourselves if we have enlisted in our rolls the sympathy and hearty co-operation of those who are able to work in the field, and as a necessity, we must also be careful in admitting into our rolls only them who are so willing to work. Only one word of caution and advice I will venture to give before I sit down; and that is, to request every member of this association to work in the best of harmony and in any investigation we may be engaged in, to approach the subject without the least taint of prejudice having in view the cause of truth and truth alone.